

used cautiously and moderately, to improve the general health, to remove chronic inflammations, and diseases of an indolent kind, indicates its use, in some few cases, for the symptoms of syphilis, as if they occurred from any other disease, without reference to any *specific character*. While I admit its use in some cases of syphilis, not for a moment *as a specific*, but on the general principles above stated, I contend that the cases requiring it are but few; a very large proportion of venereal diseases can be as well, if not better, cured without mercury, and *certainly more safely*, because the risk is not incurred of producing the truly melancholy results, which, in some constitutions, follow the treatment of syphilis with this mineral. I think its use, in primary symptoms, should be given up altogether, at least, until there appears some indication for its employment. It cannot now be maintained that a chancre is cured one day sooner where mercury is given, than where it is not; as far as any comparison of evidence goes, it would appear, that these sores are sooner cured, where mercury is not given. If this be true, we gain nothing by using this remedy, and incur the risk of inflicting a severe injury on the patient, as every practical surgeon knows well, that chancres do, sometimes assume a gangrenous and phagedenic character under the mercurial irritation, occasionally ending in the loss of a portion, or the whole of the penis, before the destructive processes can be arrested. The only intention with which mercury can be given, in this stage of the disease, is to prevent the introduction of the venereal poison into the system. But, has mercury this preventive influence? Unfortunately, the history of the venereal disease, under the most full and efficient mercurial treatment, proves that it has no such power. It is too well-known that if mercury succeeds, once, in preventing secondary symptoms, it fails, altogether, in too many instances, to allow us to place reliance on it as a preventive of constitutional symptoms. It is certain that secondary symptoms occur whether mercury be given or not; but whether they follow more frequently in the one case or the other, is, as yet, entirely undecided.

"As far as the army reports go, it would appear that secondary symptoms followed more frequently where mercury had not been used; but it must be remembered, that it was considered that the secondary symptoms following the use of mercury, were more severe and intractable than when it had not been used; no argument can hence be drawn in favour of mercury."

"Secondary symptoms supervening where mercury has not been used, are, in most instances mild, and generally yield in a short time; but where they do not," mercury, says Dr. G. "cautiously given, may be attended with benefit; if, however, when the system becomes affected from the remedy, the constitutional symptoms are aggravated, we ought immediately to stop its use, and treat the disease by other remedies; should we, however, persist in the mercurial course, we incur the risk of totally changing the character of the disease, from a *mild chronic* to a *severe and intractable one*."

We regret that our limits forbid our noticing here some of the other interesting papers and cases in these volumes, but we shall give abstracts of the most important of them in the periscope of the present or future numbers.

---

XXVI. *The Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology*. Edited by ROBERT B. TODD, M. D. Lecturer on Anatomy and Physiology at the Westminster School of Medicine, &c. &c.

We have before us the first No. of this work, which is now in the course of publication. It is to appear in parts—

"Consisting of a series of dissertations, under the headings of the more important subjects of human anatomy, general, surgical, and morbid; of phy-

siology, of comparative anatomy, and of animal chemistry, and in order to unite the advantages of a dictionary with the proposed form of the work, a very copious index will be added, containing all the terms used in the sciences with appropriate references."

Some of the most eminent men of Paris, as well as of Great Britain, are enrolled among the contributors; and from the execution of the No. before us, the work promises to be an exceedingly useful addition to our literature.

The illustrations, which are numerous, are remarkably well executed. We have reason, however, we think, to complain that the labours of our countrymen have been so far entirely overlooked. Thus, in the art. Absorption, not even allusion is made to the experiments of Rousseau, Klapp, Mussey, Coxe, Stuart, Lawrence and Coates, Luzenberg, &c. Whether this arises from ignorance or design, it is equally inexcusable.

XXVII. *A Treatise on Pulmonary Consumption; comprehending an Inquiry into the Causes, Nature, Prevention, and Treatment of Tuberculous and Scrofulous Diseases in general.* By JAMES CLARK, M. D., F. R. S. Consulting Physician to their Majesties the King and Queen of the Belgians, &c. &c. Philadelphia, p. 296, 1835.

The greater part of this treatise first appeared in the *Cyclopedia of Practical Medicine*, and has been elaborately noticed in our preceding No. (p. 303, et seq.) In publishing it as a separate work, the author has carefully revised the whole, rewritten much the greater part of it, and made considerable and interesting additions to almost every chapter, more especially to those on the causes and prevention. Having so recently devoted a large space to the analysis of the original, it is only necessary to repeat the favourable opinion of it already expressed, and to state that in its present form, its value has been much increased. We urgently recommend it to the profession as one of the most important publications on the subject of which it treats, that has yet appeared; it should be in the hands of every student, and on the table of every practitioner.

XXVIII. *Manual of Phrenology; being an Analytical Summary of the System of Dr. Gall, on the Faculties of Man and the Functions of the Brain.* Translated from the fourth French edition. Philadelphia, Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1835.

The original of this work has been already noticed, (Vol. VI. p. 193,) and it is therefore only necessary for us to state, that the translation bears marks of having been carefully made, and to refer to our review of the original publication.